

Trump, that it was about our country, and that those who refuse to vote to convict are condoning the actions of a violent mob and failing to defend the honor of our Capitol and the people who work here. This is a ridiculous and insulting argument.

Impeachment is not a way of sending a message or taking symbolic action. Impeachment exists for one principal reason: to remove from office an officeholder guilty of wrongdoing. And claiming that anyone who doesn't vote to convict someone no longer in office is the equivalent of supporting a criminal mob is nothing but hyperpartisan politicians masquerading as high-minded prosecutors trying to smear their political opponents.

The Senate does not have the constitutional power to convict a former official, and even if we did, we should be very reluctant to use it. In the 244-year history of our Republic, we have never convicted and disqualified a former official in an impeachment trial. Doing so now would create a new precedent, and it would weaponize impeachment in a way we will come to regret.

The day will come when a future Congress, one with a new majority in the House filled with new Members elected on the promise of holding accountable leaders of the opposite part, will give in to these passions and impeach a former official. The Senate will then find itself conducting a trial of that former official, a trial justified by the precedent we are asked to set here today, and a Senate tempted to convict by the tantalizing opportunity to disqualify that official from future public office.

My fear of creating dangerous precedents is not new. Two years ago, I was accused by some in my party of being a traitor because I opposed using an emergency declaration to fund a border wall that I supported. I warned then that a future Democratic President would do the same thing to fund a Green New Deal. And now, just 2 years later, leading Democrats are calling for that very thing.

The lead manager admitted today that, for the Democrats and their enablers working in the legacy media, the purpose of this trial was not to hold the former President accountable. The real purpose of this trial was to tar and feather not just the rioters, but anyone who supported the former President and any Senator who refuses to vote to convict.

I voted to acquit former President Trump because I will not allow my anger over the criminal attack of January 6 nor the political intimidation from the left to lead me into supporting a dangerous constitutional precedent.

The election is over. A new President is in the White House, and a new Congress has been sworn in. Let history and, if necessary, the courts judge the events of the past. We should be focused on the serious challenges of the

present and preparing our country to confront the serious tests it will face in the future.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, during this impeachment trial, our country has re-lived the chilling and un-American assault on the foundations of our democracy. New video footage reinforced both the brutality of the rioters and also the heroism of members of law enforcement who—just barely—prevented further loss of life. The personal threat of that day, however, is not nearly as troubling as the threat to our democracy.

After listening to the arguments from the House Managers and former President Donald Trump's defense, I voted to convict the former President. As dangerous as Donald Trump's actions were over the course of the months, days, and hours leading up to the violent insurrection, my vote was less about holding Trump as an individual accountable than it was about protecting our country from similar threats in the future, at his hands or at the hands of others.

Impeachment is not designed to punish—it was included in our Constitution to protect the Republic from abuses of power and tyranny. I voted to protect the America that we know and love because January 6, 2021, will be our future if we tolerate what the impeachment trial showed was Trump's concerted campaign to prevent the peaceful transition of power.

Of all the things former President Trump did, it is actually what he did not do once he knew the Capitol was being attacked and his own Vice President, among others, was being threatened that was most troubling.

Should there be any doubt that Trump intended to disrupt the certification of votes and encourage the violence that desecrated the Capitol, his decision to allow it to continue for hours should dispel that uncertainty.

If he had not intended the violence when it began, his failure to exercise his power to secure the Capitol and protect those inside was itself a violation of his oath of office and merits conviction and disqualification from holding future office.

Before Trump's refusal to engage in the peaceful transfer of power, the public could gather outside the Capitol; families could play soccer on the weekends, and tourists could take photos of this temple of democracy. Before COVID, the public could even walk right in, after being properly screened. But throughout the impeachment trial, we came to work through fences and barbed wire. There was no open space for the public because we have lost the common understanding that the Capitol is place where we spar with words, not physical violence.

It is fitting that the trial concluded right before we mark the birthday of George Washington, who helped establish some of the bedrock principles of our democracy not simply through his service as our first President, but by

voluntarily surrendering the office, peacefully.

Our union that Washington helped birth and that Lincoln managed to preserve is still fragile, and it cannot be taken for granted. We will need to continue the work of investigating what led to the grim events of January 6 as well as what happened on that day, and we will need to take steps to make clear that acts of tyranny will not be tolerated in our country.

We have considerable work ahead to bring our country together and strive for greater opportunity for all, both in the face of this pandemic and beyond. I am committed to continuing that work and showing the American people and the world that we are resilient, strong, and willing to renew our commitment to government of, for, and by the people.

Thank you.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of February 13, 2021, the following reports of committees were submitted on February 19, 2021:

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment: S. Res. 63. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

On February 19, 2021, under the authority of the order of the Senate of February 13, 2021, the following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. Res. 63. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance; from the Committee on Finance; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT FEBRUARY 19, 2021

SENATE RESOLUTION 63—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. WYDEN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Finance; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 63

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance is authorized from March 1, 2021, through September 30, 2021; October 1, 2021, through September 30, 2022; and October 1, 2022, through February 28, 2023, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the